

VALERIE ARROYO,

Plaintiff,

vs.


DANIEL ZAMORA, et al.,

Defendants.

On March 21, 2018, the Court dismissed the Complaint as frivolous, for failure to state a claim on which relief can be granted, and for seeking damages against immune parties. Plaintiff, for the second time, seeks to challenge that Order, but has not shown the existence of the limited circumstances under which a Rule 59(e) motion may be granted. The motion does not present evidence that was unavailable when the Complaint was filed, nor does the motion stem from an intervening change in the applicable law. Furthermore, the Plaintiff has not shown that a clear error of law has been made, or that failure to grant the motion would result in manifest injustice. See Hill, 277 F.3d at 708. For these reasons, the Court will deny the Plaintiff's Second Motion for Reconsideration. Plaintiff is cautioned that continued frivolous and duplicative *pro se* filings may result in the imposition of sanctions.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that Plaintiff's Second Motion for Reconsideration, (Doc. No. 13), is **DENIED**.

Signed: May 1, 2018



Frank D. Whitney
Chief United States District Judge

